



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MR. HART'S "ECCLESIASTICUS"

Ecclesiasticus. The Greek Text of Codex 248. Edited with a textual commentary and prolegomena by J. H. A. HART, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1909. xviii + 378 pages.

THE codex 248 in the apparatus of the large Septuagint edition begun by R. Holmes and concluded by J. Parsons (Holmes-Parsons, Oxford 1798-1827) corresponds to the Vatican MS. 346 which, together with the Vatican MS. 330 (= Holmes-Parsons 108) underlies in the main the first printed edition of the Greek text of the Old Testament (in the Complutensian Polyglot, 1514-1517). Of these two MSS., codex 248 was alone available for the book of Ecclesiasticus. Although in point of date—it is a cursive of the fourteenth century—it cannot compare with the uncials which in some cases ascend into the fourth century, its excellencies, through the medium of the Complutensian edition, have long been noted by Drusius (1596), Grabe (1709), Bretschneider (1806); and nearer to our own day, on the basis of the collation in Holmes-Parsons, by Edersheim (1888), though, singularly enough, Fritzsche (1871) had failed to perceive its importance. What was thus far a matter of inner evidence received confirmation in a manner most welcome through the discovery of the (fragmentary) Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus which for ever will be associated with the name of S. Schechter. In the preface to the edition of the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* prepared by Schechter in collaboration with the late Master of St. John's College (C. Taylor) (Cambridge 1899) it was pointed out that codex 248 either alone or in consonance with others of an equally humble, that is late, origin possessed readings, nay verses, otherwise unknown but harmonizing with the Cairo Hebrew text. It was at the instance of Dr. Schechter, as we learn now, that Professor Swete, the noted Septuagint editor, secured photo-

graphs of the Greek text of Ecclesiasticus mentioned above and invited the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press to publish a transcript. The work of publication has been carried out by Mr. Hart, Fellow of St. John's College.

So much for the history of the present publication which has been sponsored by such eminent scholars. The importance of the manuscript was so obvious to the editor that, barring a reference to Dr. Taylor's estimate, he has deemed it superfluous to sum up the excellencies of his codex or to indicate its place in the history of the Greek translation of Ben Sira. Or does this omission amount to a tacit acknowledgment that the subject has been fully treated in § 7 of Smend's Introduction to his Commentary on Ecclesiasticus (1906) and that the reader should for himself consult that work? For the purposes of this review where an adequate, though succinct, orientation is imperative Smend will indeed prove a most welcome guide. On the whole, we learn, codex 248, so far as its basis goes, is "undoubtedly the best of all". For, while it has not escaped corruptions which it has in common with many others, it alone has preserved a goodly number of correct readings, or at least it shares them with a few others. Thus it alone reads *II, 17 εὐδοῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* over against *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εὐδοθήσεται* elsewhere. In 248 the verb is put first, exactly as in the Hebrew: **וַיַּלֵּךְ לְעַד**. But that is of small moment. Of greater importance is the fact that the verb is put in the active voice and apparently is also intended in the active or transitive meaning (in 43, 26 the same form is used intransitively). Herein the Ethiopic translation concurs (*ǧāstafēsheḥ* "maketh glad"; the rendering, of course, is inexact). The variation in the Greek codices is based on a difference of exegetical conception: the Hebrew verb, written defectively (compare the spelling of the preceding word: **וַיַּצְנֵנוּ**), is naturally best pointed **וַיַּלֵּךְ** and taken transitively. The example is an instructive one also for the student of our two English versions. In the Authorized Version we read: "*and his favour bringeth prosperity for ever*"; in the Revised: "*and his good pleasure shall prosper for ever*". That is to say, the older version follows the Complutensian (hence, mediately, codex 248), whereas the Revisers go

with the uncials, marking in this case as in many others a step backward.

Another notable example in which codex 248 is alone with its better reading and in agreement with the Hebrew is found in 43, 23. The Hebrew reads:

מחשבת. . . שיש רבה ויט בתהום איים

Leaving out of our discussion for the moment whatever is irrelevant to an understanding of the general purport of the verse, so much is clear that the poet is describing God's wonders as they are manifested in the sea. It was permissible freedom on the part of the translator to combine the two nouns distributed over the two halves of the verse and to render them by one word: *the deep*; which procedure, of course, necessitated a pronominal reference thereto in the second half: *therein* (*in her*). All Greek codices further agree in their verb in the second half of the verse: *planted*. We thus recognize that ויט of our Hebrew text is faulty; ויטע was apparently the original. The second half of the verse reads accordingly in cod. 248 (and naturally in the Complutensian): καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους. And so our own Authorized Version: "*and planteth islands therein*." The steps of corruption through which the Greek text as still preserved in 248 has passed are all extant. Thus through haplography (writing once what should be written twice) the preposition dropped out: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτῇ νήσους (cod. 23). The ungrammatical sentence that ensued was corrected to read: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτῇν νήσους (cod. 253). The next step was for some Christian copyist to write: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτῇν Ἰησοῦς. Hence the note on the margin of the Revised Version: "The most ancient authorities read *Jesus planted it*"; had the Revisers been consistent, that reading would have been placed in the text. The most ancient authorities are the uncials. The error is indeed an old one, but it was apparently kept out of that manuscript whose lineal descendant codex 248 is. It may be of interest to add that, once "Jesus" took the place of "islands", he was reverently replaced by "the Lord" (in a number of cursives).

At the end of 11, 14 (immediately before the verse discussed above) a marginal note of the Revisers informs us: "Verses 15

and 16 are omitted by the best authorities". But the verses which the Authorized Version has duly incorporated in its text are found in cod. 248 along with several other cursives and are equally extant in the Hebrew! Another example is afforded by 16, 15, 16 (codex 248 and others, the Hebrew text). 3, 25 is an instance of a single verse omitted by "most authorities", but found in codex 248 (253 and partially 70) along with the Hebrew. The importance of codex 248 is thus proved conclusively, no matter what our opinion may be concerning its redundant stichoi (of which there are in the group of manuscripts of which codex 248 is the best representative about 150) and its other amplifications. Professor Smend (§ 8) adduces much proof in support of a thesis that all these amplifications go back in the main to a Hebrew original, though they may not be ascribed to Ben Sira himself. The process he conceives as follows: Ben Sira's unglossed original was translated by his grandson. The Hebrew original in course of time was touched up by an interpolator. With this amplified Hebrew text before him, some Greek-speaking Jew corrected the older Greek translation so as to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew as he knew it. The uncials on the whole have preserved the unglossed older translation; in codex 248 and the kindred manuscripts we have the contaminated text. That a double Greek translation existed may be proved by the fact that in a few cases the divergences in the Greek manuscripts are paralleled by similar divergences in the Hebrew. Thus for 5, 11 we have two Hebrew manuscripts (A and C) available; the text of A coincides with the ordinary Greek, while the text of C goes with 248 and 70. In other instances one and the same Hebrew text is found to contain a verse in a double version; on Greek ground the manuscripts divide themselves into two groups, according as they follow the one or the other. Compare 34, 20; 35, 22, and elsewhere (the second Greek text is represented by the Latin). Or our Hebrew exhibits the amplified text alone; accordingly it is found to correspond to an amplified form in a certain group of manuscripts. Compare 16, 3: the present Hebrew text is borne out by Chrysostom, the first corrector of the Sinaitic, and 248. 70.

That we are dealing only with one interpolator (glossator) and not with many is easily proved by the uniformity of ideas running through the entire range of amplifications. There is a certain character to them. The subject has been treated most fully by Schlatter (1897). His conclusion that the author of the glosses was a Greek (Alexandrian) Jew, either the philosopher Aristobulus or some one belonging to his school, is now easily refuted by the presence of a number of them in the Hebrew. Hence they must have all been written in Hebrew. Who was this Jew who was greatly concerned with emphasizing the love of the Lord (ἀγάπης κυρίου; there is reason to believe that 11, 15 נֶחֱדָה should be read in the place of נֶחֱדָה) rather than the fear of the Lord, who speaks of man's *cleaving* to God, of God's *reception* and *rejection* (πρόσληψις and ἐκβολή; comp. πρόσληψις and ἀποβολή Romans 11, 15), and of reward in a future life as the fruit of the tree of *immortality*, to mention but the most striking characteristics of his thought? Mr. Hart devotes to this question the second chapter of his "Prolegomena" (printed at the end of the volume). The discussion is a most thorough one, but the answer, I fear, will not commend itself to cautious readers. Some truth, of course, there is in designating the interpolator as a Pharisee and his recension of Ben Sira as Pharisaic. But there is more than that in Mr. Hart's thesis. Out of the sum of the glosses he would reconstruct the whole body of "Early" Pharisaic doctrine. It becomes thus necessary not only to identify positive Pharisaic teachings, but likewise to recognize in everything that is condemned or rejected at once a Sadducæan doctrine. The method is that of Geiger, and is open to the same criticism. Mr. Hart tacitly accepts Geiger's identification of the Pharisees (*Perushim*, *Perishin*) with the *Nibdalim* of Nehem. 9, 2. "Being translated Pharisaism is Separatism. But Separatism was not an ideal which could thrill the nations with an instantaneous and irresistible appeal". In Mr. Hart's conception, the Pharisee is necessarily a missionary "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matth. 23, 15). By deft manipulations, "transliterations", as Mr. Hart calls them, he makes the *Pharisaism*, which means Separatism, appear to the Greeks as *Parrhesia*. The latter meant to the

Greek freedom of speech; the Jewish missionary, by a semasiological (though not "logical") twist, makes it to stand for confidence, confidence in one Master. But P-R-Sh, a "versatile" root, means also *making distinct*. And so the Pharisaic glossator plays with Greek ἀκρίβεια *exactitude*; the *Pharisee* becomes a *Precisian* (which assonance, alas, is lost on Greek ears). The interpolator dwells repeatedly on ἐπαγγελία *promise*. The very same Greek word occurs in the Greek translation of Esther (4, 7: καὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν (τοῦ ἀργυρίου) ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο and the promise (of the silver) that ... had promised). The corresponding Hebrew word is *parashah* (lit. *making distinct*, hence *exact statement*). The translator of Esther, as elsewhere, is given to the very opposite of literalism; he translates according to the general sense; the combination with *Pharisaism* is furthest from his mind. Mr. Hart is of a different opinion. In the two other places where the Greek word "stands as an equivalent to some Hebrew word, it is always to a word, whose root belongs in one way or another to the *Teaching of the Scribes of (or?) the Pharisees*". The passages in question are Amos 9, 6 and Ps. 55 (56), 8. In the former place אֲנִתָּהּ was misconceived as אֲנִתָּהּ. The student interested in the history of the *Haggadah* will be glad to learn how old that word is even in its Aramaized form *Aggadah*. The Greek equivalent may and may not have meant *promise*; it was chosen for the reason that the verb from which the Hebrew noun is derived is so often translated by ἀγγέλλειν and its compounds. In the other place, the Greek word corresponds to *Siphrah* (not *Sepher*, as Mr. Hart writes). But just as ἐξηγγείλας (so read for ἐξηγγείλα; the *ς* dropped out in front of σύ 27. 156 (σοι of the others is clearly an error; comp. the opposite Judg. 12, 1 συνεθροίσθησαν 75 for -ροίσθησαν 54. 82) = אֲתָּה corresponds to כִּפְרָתָה (as the translator read for כִּפְרָתָה), so does ἐπαγγελία to כִּפְרָה. The *Sopher* was altogether foreign to the translator's mind. Mr. Hart has, however, overlooked a third passage. Of course, the Oxford Concordance, as so often, failed to register the Hebrew equivalent. I mean the passage I Esdras 1, 7 = II Chron. 35, 8: κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν corresponds to לְנִרְכָּה. The translation is again a bit free. But surely no mean stretch of the imagination would be required to

drag in in this instance the *Scribe* or *Pharisee*. Another "echo of *Pharisee*" Mr. Hart finds in the *peras* of Abot 1, 3 with which he identifies the *merces dei* (Latin 18, 22; comp. 2, 9 248).

Another case of paronomasia in which Mr. Hart so much delights is the (tacit) antithesis between the *Musar*, or Discipline, with which a Sage like Ben Sira was concerned, and the *Masorah*, or Tradition, the stock-in-trade of the Scribes. Now there is nothing in the interpolated passages to directly suggest the latter term. But Mr. Hart is inventive, or ingenious, enough to furnish an example. I reproduce his conclusions at which he arrives inductively, in the opposite, deductive, manner. Akiba designates Tradition as a "fence" (סִינִי) to the Law. סוּהָ Cant. 7, 2 is rendered in the Septuagint περιφραγή. According to the testimony of Jerome, περίφραγμα was used by one of the Greek translators for MASOR (Micah 7, 12). Hence περίφραγμα "was the proper equivalent of the sound *Masorah*". Mr. Hart says, *sound*; that is to say, the orthography and the underlying etymology are of no moment (מַצוֹר and מְסוּרָה!). A parallel Greek form is περιφραγή, *fence*. Thus was the Pharisaic tradition designated in Greek. A friend or a foe passed therefrom easily to περιγραφή, "About-Scripture". This, according to Mr. Hart, is the sense of the word in 22, 23. The Greek word, it must be admitted, is difficult in the context. The meaning "mean estate" assumed by the Authorized Version cannot be paralleled elsewhere. Nevertheless Mr. Hart's exegesis will hardly convince students who are less imaginative.

And one more instance of "ingenious" combination. II, 11: "There is one that laboreth, and taketh pains, and maketh haste, and is so much the more behind" is followed in 70. 253 by the gloss: "because of the ἐπαγγελία of his own shoulders". The phrase occurs elsewhere in a late Greek writer (Philostratus). Mr. Hart combines the "*promise* (or, as he renders, *profession*) of the shoulders" with the פְּרוֹשׁ שִׁכְמִי, the type of the reprehensible Pharisee who carries the commandments upon his *shoulder* (כִּיתְפָּא עַל כִּיתְפָּא טַעִין מְצוּתָא p. Berakot 14b). It is certainly ingenious, but far from convincing.

The missionary Scribe once more reappears in Mr. Hart's Prolegomena. He is the connecting link between the second and

first chapter. Mr. Hart sums up in the latter the results of a penetrating exegesis of the Prologue (the genuine one of the uncials, not the spurious fabrication of codex 248) under six heads. The sixth thesis reads. "He (that is, the grandson) came to Egypt and remained there in accordance with the rule of his order, which prescribed foreign travel and missionary work as part of a Scribe's novitiate." What is the basis for assuming that there was such an institution as *peregrinatio Scribarum*? Here are the data as they present themselves to Mr. Hart. The Prologue opens with the statement that since Israel possesses in the Law and the Prophets and the others that followed them a great store of instruction and wisdom, and since it is proper that the scribes (τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας) should not only become intelligent themselves, but also useful (χρησίμους) to them without (τοῖς ἐκτός) by speech and by writing, the grandfather, after a diligent study (ἀνάγνωσις) of the Law and the Prophets and the other books of the fathers wherein he gained sufficient skill, was impelled himself also to compose a work pertaining to instruction and wisdom, etc. "Those without" would seem naturally to point to the laity; according to Mr. Hart, the phrase designates those in the Dispersion (comp. τοῖς ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ at the end of the Prologue), "Jews, or Gentiles". To these it is the duty of the Scribe to become "useful"; Mr. Hart adds, as missionaries, "or, to use the older term, as Apostles. In Hebrew the difference between Apostle (שְׁלוּחַ) and useful (root צִלַח) is small enough to be disregarded". So it is a case of paronomasia again. It is, however, to say the least, an unwarranted assumption in substantiation of which two verses in the body of the book (10, 4 f.) are subjected to textual and exegetical distortion, and that in the face of the Hebrew which is extant! The verses in question read as follows:

ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου ἐξουσία τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸν χρησίμον ἐγερεῖ εἰς καιρὸν
ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

בִּיד אֱלֹהִים מִמְשַׁלַּת תְּבֵל
וְאִישׁ לַעַת יַעֲמֵד עָלֶיהָ:

ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου ἐνδοξία ἀνδρός,
καὶ προσώπῳ γραμματέως ἐπιθήσει
δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

בִּיד אֱלֹהִים מִמְשַׁלַּת כָּל נֶבֶר
וּלְפָנַי מְחֻקָּק יֵשִׁית הוֹדוֹ:

The Hebrew text leaves no doubt that Ben Sira meant by the *meḥoḳēḳ* a *prince*. The translator substituted "*scribe*" after the manner of the Targums (comp. Smend and Hart *ad locum*). But the Scribe is needed by Mr. Hart for his constructions, especially since he is paralleled in the preceding verse by the "useful man". But the adjective "useful" does not appear in the Hebrew, on the surface at any rate. The truth is namely that the adjective is derived from the context; it is a free, but justifiable, addition. Mr. Hart, however, is bent upon vindicating for it a Hebrew origin. In his Notes he retranslates it as כִּשְׁר (so does Lévi); here he believes that it is an alternative of *εὐδία ἀνδρός* in the next verse to which in the Hebrew some derivative of צִלַּח corresponded. Smend is also tempted to postulate on the basis of *εὐδία* (comp. 38, 13) מִצִּלַּחַת for מִמִּשְׁלַחַת. But he does not press his point. Mr. Hart, however, needs the juxtaposition of the *Scribe* and the *useful man*; and so the text must be twisted accordingly. There is absolutely no foundation for the thesis that "Jesus ben Sira and his fellow sages inherited the prophecy that Israel should be the light of the Gentiles and strove to effect its fulfilment; they had a care for those without, whether they were Jews who needed confirmation, proselytes who needed instruction or pagans who needed conversion". To Ben Sira the sum and substance of Isaiah's book of prophecies consisted in "comforting them that mourned for Zion" (48, 24). "Those without" meant to the grandson simply the laity.

Equally unfounded is the fifth thesis: "The younger ben Sira came to Egypt in 247 B. C. and took part in the translation of the Wisdom Literature which was then proceeding. His contribution was probably more than the rendering of his grandfather's composition". We may divide the thesis into two parts: (1) the grandson came to Egypt in 247 B. C.; (2) he took part in the translation of a part of the Bible over and above the rendition of his grandfather's work. The first proposition turns about the exegesis of the preposition ἐπὶ (line 16 of Swete's edition), as is well known a muchly disputed point. According to Mr. Hart, the preposition is far from being a pleonastic ornament, but a very significant element. The thirty-eighth year refers to the

death-year of Ptolemy Philadelphus who reigned thirty-eight years; it was the year in which Euergetes (I.) succeeded to the throne, and that is the purport of the second chronological date significantly introduced by the preposition. Mr. Hart argues that under Euergetes II. whose policy was "Egypt for the Egyptians" the time was inopportune for the grandson's missionary journey. However that may be, the force of an innocent preposition which has its parallels in Septuagint Greek and in the papyri cannot be strained to the point of constructing a chronological theory which must remain questionable. The date of Ben Sira himself is not affected whether we follow the current interpretation of *ἐπὶ* or not; that depends on the meaning of *πάππος* and the identification of Simon the Priest. As for the second proposition, it is based entirely upon an unwarranted differentiation of *τήνδε τὴν βίβλον* (line 19) and *τὸ βιβλίον* (line 21). The two are of course identical. Mr. Hart, however, makes the second noun refer to some other book, perhaps even the Bible. To say the least, there is left but scant time between the reign of Philadelphus and the death of Euergetes I. for the entire Scriptures to be done into Greek. The "space of time" was clearly ample for translating the Wisdom of Ben Sira, but hardly for much else beside. Mr. Hart is indeed constrained to assume that "the limits of the undertaking (as set by Demetrius of Phalerum and Ptolemy Philadelphus) were exceeded, so that the Prophecies and other books were included with the Law in the Alexandrian translation" (fourth thesis). The Seventy must then indeed have been a zealous body; they are in truth designated by Mr. Hart as "missionaries". So much, however, is beyond doubt to anybody without a pet theory of his own that the translator of Ben Sira found in Egypt the tripartite Bible in Greek; freely as he criticises that translation, he at the same time permits us to infer that it enjoyed no small measure of authority.

Of the four chapters of the Prolegomena which seems to be a collective name for essays on Ben Sira only the two last ("The Quotations of Clement of Alexandria" and "The Conflict of the Rival Greek Versions") have an immediate bearing on codex 248; the third ("The Pharisaic Recension of the Wisdom of Ben Sira")

is only indirectly connected therewith, and the first ("The Prologue of the Greek Translator") not at all. The edition is further enriched by a valuable Textual Commentary which, we are told, was in the main printed off in 1903. The only regret which one may be permitted to express concerning these Notes is that they were not based primarily on the codex edited. As the case stands, the references to codex 248 are casual and on a line with the rest of the textual material industriously gathered together. As for the character of the Notes, I have examined the part dealing with 3, 6-24 more closely. A few remarks may be apposite. Verse 6: *τιμησει* = **ת**.— Verse 12: The propounded emendation *γερ*a is not convincing. The translator rather read בכבור for בכר, comp. **כביר** Job 15, 10. — Verse 16. **מנרף** is probable; but comp. Smend.— **עוב** is possible, but not necessary; comp. *ἐγκ.* = **מאם ב** Isa. 41, 9.— In *b* no attempt is made to explain **ע**; comp. Smend. Perhaps the Hebrew text represents a *tiḥkun*: the original then read: **כי מנרף בוח אביו ומקלל בורא מכעים אמו**.— Verse 17: Not **עשוך**, but **מעשיך**; so Smend.— *Ib.*: The Latin points to *υπερ ανθρωπον δεκτον*. The original probably read **איש חן**, comp. Prov. 19, 6 where *σνευδος* = **חסד** ~ **חן**.— Verse 18. Not **בן**; **ע** read **בכל**; *σσω* ... *τοσσουτω* expresses **כל**, comp. the Latin. — *Ib.*: Not "humble thyself from", but "hold thyself too humble for"; comp. Gen. 32, 11 and the Oxford Gesenius, p. 582 *b.*—*Ib.* *χαρις* = **ת**; comp. Gen. 43, 14; Dan. 1, 9.— Verse 21: *βαθυτερα* = **עמוקה** p. Hag. 77 *c* (Smend).— *Ib.* *επεινα* is either a synonymous variant, or = **חשאל** Gen. 1. ch. 8; comp. Deut. 23, 24(15).— Verse 22: *χρεια* = **צר** (Peters; rejected by Smend) or **חפץ** (קר) Hag. 13 *a* M).— Verse 23: *περιεργαζου* is a crux on which nothing is said, but on which a good deal might be said.— Verse 24. Very inadequate. For **רמינות רעות** (nobody seems to notice the difficulty) comp. **ענינות רחוקות** 7, 2, **יסורי התורה** Maimon. **ועשתנתיו מתטרפות** id. **ניזר** 1, 5 (see Bacher, *Tanchum*, 123).

To the Textual Commentary belongs also the "Appendix" which contains a collation of the Syro-Hexaplar with the text of B.

The reprint of codex 248 is a faithful one; wherever the editor has deemed it necessary to deviate from his text, the reading of the codex is given on the margin. Of course, a permissible difference of opinion may obtain as to what constitutes the task

of the editor of a single codex. Mr. Hart adopted the plan of a mere reprint after the fashion of the edition of the Alexandrine text of the Book of Judges by Brooke-McLean (Cambridge 1897). But then the entire apparatus which follows and which at best has only indirect connections with the codex edited should have remained away, valuable as it all may be in spite of the strictures to which the bolder propositions are open. There was certainly another plan, perhaps a more difficult one, possible: to wit, an edition after the manner of that of the first five chapters of Judges by Lagarde (*Septuagintastudien I*). While in point of fact a definitive grouping of the Greek manuscripts of Ecclesiasticus may be premature, the medley of variants contained in Parsons' apparatus might have conveniently, though provisionally, been grouped about codex 248 on the one and B on the other hand. An edition like that, perhaps even with the Syriac and Hebrew texts added, a sort of Tetrapla, would have served much more effectively to bring out the value of the codex 248. Nevertheless, it behooves us to be thankful for what we have received. We are once more brought face to face with the fact that the collation of (Holmes-)Parsons is unreliable. I have compared Mr. Hart's reprint of codex 248 with the data in Parsons; the following list of corrections has been the result:

Parsons	Hart
tit. Σοφια Ιησου υιον Σιραχ	prm ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ
—	tit. (post prologum)
	ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ
1, 18 φόβος Κυριον (sil)	φοβεισθαι τον κυριον = 70. Compl.
— 24 παραβολη (sil)	παραβολαι = 70. Compl.
2, 1 τω Κυριω θεω (vid)	τω κυριω = 106. 307. Compl.
— 6 ευθυνον (sil)	prm και = 55. 155. 157. 296. 307.
	Compl.
— 9 Κυριον (sil)	prm τον = 253
3, 3 εξιλασεται (sil)	εξιλασκειται (i. e., κ' delet) = Compl.
— 6 fin (sil)	+ ο φοβουμενος Κυριον τιμησει πατερα
— 24 μεν	μη = 253. Compl.
— — αμοιρος ων	αμοιρων = Compl.
4, 10 ορφανους (sil)	ορφανω = Compl.

- 24 εν ρηματι (sil) εν ρημασι = Compl.
 5, 5 εν πλεονασμοις (ut vid scr εν πλεονασμῶ = Compl.
 πλεονασμονς)
 — 34 σοφος (sil) Cod. prima manu σοι; secunda σοφ⁰
 — 37 σου >248. 106. 155. 157. Compl.
 7, 18 αδιαφορον μηδε εν αδιαφορον κατα μηδε εν = Compl.
 8, 2 αντιστηση αντιστησει = 157. Compl.
 9, 9 ολισθησης ολισθης = 55. 157. Compl.
 10, 4 εξουσια prm η = 23. 55. 106. 155. 157.
 Compl.
 — 6 μηνιασης μηνισης = 23. 106. Compl.
 — 9 ενδοσθια εντοσθια
 — 18 ανθρωπος ἄνος
 — 24 μεγαισταν δε μεγαιστανες = 23. Compl.
 — 25 πας δενομενος παιδενομενος = Compl.
 12, 2 ευσεβει ευσεβη = 106. 307. Compl.
 — 3 ελεημοσυνην ελεημοσυνης = Compl.
 — 16 ανατρεψαι (sil) αναστρεψαι = Ald. (comp. 23).
 13, 2 (και πλουσιωτερω) σου >
 — ab al. m. sup sec manu
 — 26 διαλογισμοι (sil) διαλογισμος = 23. 253. Compl.
 14, 15 διαιρεσιν (sil) διαιρεσεις = 55. 106. 157. 307.
 Compl. διαιρεσις 155
 — 16 τροφην (sil) τροφην = Compl.
 — 25 χειρας (sil) χειρα
 15, 3 ποτισει (sil) ποτιει = 155. 157. 254. 296. 307.
 Compl.
 — 8 υπερηφανιας prm απο = 106. Compl.
 — 13 καθυστερησει (sil) -ριση comp. -ρηση 106. 307. Compl.
 — 18 σαλευθησονται -θησεται 155. 296*. Compl.
 — 19 εις τ' αυτα Κυριον επ' αυτα Κυριον = Compl.
 — 28 εθλιψε (sil) εξεθλιψε(ν) = 23. 55. 106. 155 307.
 307. Compl.
 17, 6 ερμηνεια ερμενεα
 — 28 μηδε (sil) μηδεν
 — 31 και πονηρος (sil) και ανηρ ος = Compl.
 18, 4 εξιχνιασει (sil) εξιχνιασε = Compl.
 — 10 και ψηφος αμμου (sil) και ως ψηφος αμμου = Compl.

- 16 κρεισσων (sil) κρεισσον 307. Compl.
 —27 και αφρων συντηρησει καιρον και αφρων ου συντηρησει καιρον = 106.
 Compl.
 19, 12 βελος (sil) μελος
 — 25 εστι δικαιων κρισει σοφος και εστι κτλ. = Compl.
 21, 2 οδοντες αυτης (sil) οδοντες αυτη = Compl.
 22, 7 καθενδοντα (sil) καθενδοντας = Compl.
 — 15 αλα (sil) αλας = 253. 296. Compl.
 — 22 εν τουτοις (sil) + γαρ = Compl.
 23, 10 αμαρτιας αμαρτιων
 — 14 συνεδρενεις (sil) συνεδρενσεις = Compl.
 — 22 καταλειπονσα (sil) καταλειπονσα = Compl.
 24, 4 κατεσκαψωσα (sil) + μονη
 — 6 κυμασι (sil) κυματι = Compl.
 — 7 μετα τουτων (sil) prn και = Compl.
 — 9 αιωνος (sil) αιωνων = 253. Compl.
 25, 3 εν νεοτητι σου εν νεοτητι
 — 17 σκοτει (sil) σκοτοι
 26, 12 συνεγγυς (sil) συνεγγυς pr. m.
 — 18 ευγεων ευγεον
 27, 12 διανοουμενων (sil) - νου
 27, 27 κυλισθησεται (sil) αυλισθησεται = Compl.
 28, 10 κατα την ισχυν prn κατα την στερεωσιν της μαχης το
 πυρ αυξηθησεται = Compl.
 — 24 και το χρυσιον σου και χρυσιον σου
 — 15 mrg. εγγυς εγγυς
 — 27 επεξενωται επιξενωται
 30, 1 ενδελεχσει ενδελεχσει = 106. Compl.
 — 15 Περι βρωματος Περι βρωματος
 — 18 εκλεισμενα εκλεισμενα = Compl.
 — 16 επληρωσα (sil) επλησα = 23. Compl.
 — 25 ζητησεις ζητησει = Compl.
 31, 10 επειραθη (sil) επειρασθη = 23. 106. 155. Compl.
 32, 15 και η καταβοησις (sil) + αυτον = Compl.
 34, 10 εστω (sil) εσται = 106. 254. Compl.
 — 24 διαγογγυσει (sil) γογγυσει
 35 tit. Περι ηγουμενων (sil) > 248. 55. 106. 155. 157. 253. 254.
 296. 307. Compl.

— 18 <i>αλλοτριος</i> (sil)	+ δε = 307. Compl.
— — <i>μετ αυτου</i> (sil)	<i>μεθ εαυτου</i> = Compl.
36, 17 <i>ικετων</i> (sil)	<i>οικετων</i> = A. 155. Compl.
38, 13 <i>ευωδια</i> (sil)	<i>ευοδια</i> = Grabe
— 16 <i>εναρξε</i> (sil)	<i>εναρξαι</i> = 68. 106. 254. 307. Compl.
— 27 <i>υπομονη</i> (sil)	<i>επιμονη</i> = 157. 253. 296. 307
— 28 <i>σφυρας</i>	+ <i>και ακμονος</i> = Compl.
39, 2 <i>διηγησεις</i> (sil)	<i>διηγησιν</i> = 23. 55. 106. 155. 157. 254.
— — <i>στροφαις</i> (sil)	296. 307. Compl.
— 4 <i>ηγουμενον</i> (sil)	<i>τροφαις</i>
	<i>ηγουμενον</i> = 23. 55. 106. 157. 253.
	254. 296. 307. Compl.
— 27 <i>ταυτα παντα</i> (sil)	tr
— 28 <i>πνευματι</i> (sil)	<i>πνευματα</i>
— 31 <i>χρειας</i> (sil)	<i>χειρας</i> = A. Compl.
40, 1 <i>εαν</i>	<i>εως</i>
— 4 <i>νακινθινον</i>	<i>νακινθον</i>
41, 32 <i>φιλων</i> (sil)	<i>φιλον</i> = 55. 254. Compl.
42, 5 <i>αδιαφορον</i> (sil)	<i>διαφορον</i> = A. 155. 157. 307.
	Compl.
— 17 <i>ο (παντοκρατωρ)</i>	> 248. Compl.
43, 23 <i>αβυσσον</i> (sil)	<i>αβυσσος</i> = 55. 106. 155. 157.
44, 5 <i>διηγουμενοι</i> (sil)	prm <i>και</i> = 55. 106. 155. 157.
	254. 296. Compl.
— 18 <i>ετεθησαν</i> (sil)	<i>εσταθησαν</i> = 253. Compl.
45, 3 <i>λογις</i> (sil)	<i>λογις</i> = Compl.
— — <i>αυτον</i> (sil)	<i>ατον</i>
— 8 <i>σκενεσιν</i> (sil)	prm <i>εν</i> = Compl.
47, 8 <i>και ηγαπησε τον ποιησαντα αυτον</i>	>; hab mrg.
— 18 <i>του (Θεου)</i>	<i>σου</i> = Compl.
— 19 <i>σου</i>	<i>συν</i>
48, 14 <i>και εν τελευτη αυτου</i>	<i>και εν τη τελευτη αυτου</i> = Compl.
49, 5 <i>εδωκαν</i> (sil)	<i>εδωκε(ν)</i> = 155*. Compl.
— 6 <i>ενεπυρησαν</i>	<i>ενεπρησαν</i> = Compl.
50, 2 <i>περιβολον</i> (sil)	<i>περιβολον</i> = Compl.
— 9 <i>ολοσφυρητον</i> (sil)	<i>ολοσφυρατον</i> = 23. 55. 254
— 20 <i>Κυριω</i> (sil)	<i>Κυριον</i> = 23. 253. Compl.
— 10 <i>εγκαταλιπειν</i> (sil)	<i>εγκαταλιπη</i>

— 14 <i>vaov</i> (sil)	<i>incertum an vaov</i>
— 21 <i>κοιλια</i> (sil)	<i>καρδια</i>
— 24 <i>διψωσαι</i> (sil)	<i>διψωσι</i>

I have omitted from the list matters orthographical and the like which have no immediate bearing upon the sense. The list affords correction in 118 places. Which, of course, goes to show how inaccurate the collation of Parsons is. One important result of Mr. Hart's reprint is the knowledge how much closer the identity of the Complutensian text and codex 248 is. Otherwise the net practical result is an extremely meager one. For, as may be readily seen, in the majority of cases the reading of codex 248 is identical with a reading adduced by Parsons from other sources. The same observation has been made by Smend with reference to other codices imperfectly collated by Parsons; a comparison of the parts of the larger Cambridge edition so far issued with the corresponding parts of Holmes-Parsons reveals the same state of affairs. Holmes-Parsons is still a useful guide for all practical purposes.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS